

REMARKS

Allowance of claims 26 and 27 is respectfully acknowledged and the above amendments and following remarks are submitted in an effort to remove the remaining expressed grounds for objections and rejections.

The Title has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 2, 14, 17, 19-22, 26-28 and 32-37 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 3-13, 15, 16, 18, 23-25 and 29-31 stand either cancelled or withdrawn in an effort to expedite prosecution of the current application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these claims either through a subsequent rejoinder or in a later filing. Claims 2, 14, and 17, 19-22 have been amended to revise dependency in light of cancellation of Claim 1. Claim 2 has been amended to include specific definitions for the terms aryl and aryl-C₁₋₇-alkyl. Support for the amendment in claim 2 may be found on page 5, line 27 to page 6, line 20 and page 7, lines 5-7, respectively. Newly presented Claims 38 and 39 depend from allowed claims 26 and 27 respectively and specifically claim the free and pharmaceutically acceptable salt forms. Support for pharmaceutically acceptable salt forms may be found on page 8, lines 22-23.

Applicants confirm the **provisional restriction, with traverse**, to Group III, which includes currently pending claims 2, 14, 17, 19-22, 26-28, drawn to compounds and pharmaceutical compositions of Formula I, wherein $m = 1$, $n = 1$, and $X = R^1-SO_2NR^2$; R^1-CONR^2 ; aryl- R^8-CONR^2 ; or $R^1-NR^3CONR^2$. Applicants also wish to clarify that although Applicants accurately named the elected species for search purposes as Example 15, either a transcription or typographic error resulted in the wrong chemical name being provided in the previous response. The correct chemical name, as appears in the original disclosure of Example 15 in the specification, is *N*-(1-(2-[3-(2,6-Dimethyl-pyridin-4-yl)-ureido]-ethyl)-piperidin-4-yl)-*N*-ethyl-4-methoxy-benzenesulfonamide. Applicants sincerely apologize for any confusion this error may have introduced into the record.

Objections to the Specification and Rejections of the Claims under 35 USC §112 have been addressed by the significant refocusing of the scope of present claim 2 (where n is 1, R_6 and R_7 are H, and specific definitions of aryl-C₁₋₇-alkyl and aryl have been

introduced) as well as the deletion of the erroneously maintained meanings of R_4 and R_5 which were rendered superfluous by previous amendments. The term aryl is now precisely defined and supported by particular and specifically named residues contained in original disclosure. The method to synthesize compounds in the new, significantly restricted scope of claim 2 is described in scheme D on pages 34 and 35 of the application as filed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments and remarks were made in a good faith effort to remove the previously expressed grounds and bring the scope of the claims under consideration in condition commensurate in scope with fully informing disclosure contained in the specification. Applicants therefore suggest that a renewed *Wands* analysis will confirm that one of ordinary skilled in the art would be adequately informed by the written description contained in original disclosure sufficient to enable the practice of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. Accordingly, the current specification and claims are respectfully submitted to be in form to overcome the previously expressed rejections and objections. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

This response is being timely filed within the three month shortened statutory period set in the Office Action mailed on June 10, 2009. If any fees are deemed to be due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-4255.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Oct 9, 2009



Brian W. Stegman
Reg. No. 30,977

Hoxie & Associates LLC
75 Main Street, Suite 301
Millburn, NJ 07041
973-912-5232 phone
973-912-5236 fax